

In re Patent Application of
YANCY ET AL.
Serial No. 10/806,948
Filed: MARCH 23, 2004

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the careful and thorough examination of the present application. The Examiner is also thanked for the courtesies extended during the telephonic interviews of February 2, 2009 and February 10, 2009, during which the current claim rejections and the prior art were discussed, and during which the Examiner agreed that the claim amendments made herein would define over the prior art. Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 12, 21, 26 and 36 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

The Examiner rejected independent Claims 1, 12, 21, 26 and 36, based on a combination of Dellmo et al., Dichter, and Mitsuoka et al. Independent Claim 12 was rejected further in view of Stevens. As an initial matter, Applicants point out that Independent Claims 1, 12, 21, 26 and 36 have been amended to remove the recitation of the user network interface including a plurality of different connectors for coupling the cryptographic module to different network devices. Applicants understand that the Dichter reference will no longer be used in the Examiner's rejection.

Independent Claims 1, 12, 21, 26 and 36 have also been amended to recite each cryptographic processor command packet includes an address portion for addressing the cryptographic processor circuit, and the cryptographic processor strips the address portion from each cryptographic processor command packet

In re Patent Application of
YANCY ET AL.
Serial No. 10/806,948
Filed: MARCH 23, 2004

and passing the encapsulated communications module command packets to the communications module without performing cryptographic processing thereon. Applicants submit that even a selective combination of Dellmo et al. and Mitsuoka et al. fails to disclose the each cryptographic processor command packet includes an address portion for addressing the cryptographic processor circuit, and the cryptographic processor strips the address portion from each cryptographic processor command packet and passing the encapsulated communications module command packets to the communications module without performing cryptographic processing thereon, as recited in amended independent Claims 1, 12, 21, 26 and 36. Additionally, Stevens, which is cited as disclosing an SNMP protocol adds nothing to the critical deficiencies of Dellmo et al. and Mitsuoka et al.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the amended independent claims are patentable over the prior art. In view of the patentability of the independent claims, it is submitted that their dependent claims, which recite yet further distinguishing features, are also patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons set forth above. Accordingly, these dependent claims require no further discussion herein.

In re Patent Application of
YANCY ET AL.
Serial No. 10/806,948
Filed: MARCH 23, 2004

II. CONCLUSION

It is submitted that all of the claims are patentable. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is therefore respectfully requested in due course. If the Examiner determines any remaining informalities exist, he is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



DAVID S. CARUS
Reg. No. 59,291
Allen, Dyer, Doppelt, Milbrath
& Gilchrist, P.A.
255 S. Orange Avenue, Suite 1401
Post Office Box 3791
Orlando, Florida 32802
407-841-2330
407-841-2343 fax
Attorney for Applicants